Please amend the claims to read as indicated in the following list of claims:

1. [Currently amended]   A method of defining a common interactions protocol between two entities, the method comprising:

converting syntactic specifications of multiple documents to be passed between the entities, into a skeleton semantic web ontology comprising a set of classes;

~~inputting~~ deriving for each entity a respective set of constraints ~~description of each entity's messaging guidelines, the description~~ including ~~the entity's~~ semantic constraints established by the entity on aspects of the classes of the skeleton ontology ~~on interacting with the other entity~~;

calculating the union of the two sets of constraints ~~descriptions~~;

determining, using a constraint resolver that comprises a description logic reasoner, whether the union is satisfiable, and: ~~using a constraint resolver;~~

where the union is satisfiable, deriving from
~~providing~~ the intersection of the two ~~descriptions~~
sets of constraints a restricted document
specification that is compatible with the constraint
sets of both entities; ~~as the common interactions~~
~~protocol if the union is satisfiable;~~ and

where the union is not satisfiable, indicating
where any incompatibility lies ~~if the union is not~~
~~satisfiable~~.

Claim 2. Canceled.

3. [Currently amended]   A method according to claim [[2]]
1, wherein the syntactic specifications ~~messaging
guidelines~~ are input as XML Schemas.

Claims 4-8. Canceled.

9. [Currently amended]   A method according to claim 1,
wherein the restricted document specification comprises
both a specification of applicable syntactic constraints
and a specification of ~~providing step comprises providing a
specific subset of the common interactions protocol as a
set of~~ applicable semantic constraints ~~constaints~~.

Claims 10-12. Cancelled.

13. [Currently amended]   A method according to claim 2,
further comprising at least one said entity ~~wherein the
inputting step comprises:~~
     pre-specifying semantic ~~document~~ constraints and
associating them with deployment contexts; ~~in a general way
such that they are applicable to a plurality of specific
instances/classes of objects/processes; and linking each
constraint to a~~
     the deriving of the set of constraints for that entity
comprising defining a particular deployment context for the
common interactions protocol, and
     determining which of the pre-specified semantic
constraints are applicable to said particular deployment
context ~~in which that constraint is to be applied; such
that when a run-time solution of the interaction protocol~~

~~is deployed, it can be decided depending on the deployment~~
~~context whether or not each constraint applies to any~~
~~document~~.

14. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13,
wherein the <u>deployment context associated with at least one</u>
<u>pre-specified semantic constraint is specified in generic</u>
<u>terms covering multiple particular deployment contexts</u>
~~messaging constraints are syntactic~~.

Claim 15. Canceled.

16. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13,
wherein the deployment context<u>s are specified by</u> ~~comprises~~
one or more elements from the set comprising the document,
the sender, the receiver, the backend system, the business
process and the department.

17. [Currently amended] A method according to claim <u>16</u> ~~13~~,
wherein the deployment contexts are expressed using Boolean
logic between the elements.

18. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13,
wherein the <u>pre-</u>specifying step comprises specifying
~~constrainst~~ <u>constraints</u> applicable to whole classes of
objects/processes.

Claims 19-43. Canceled.